arXiv:1511.05479v1 [cs.CG] 17 Nov 2015

# Declutter and Resample: Towards parameter free denoising

Mickaël Buchet* Tamal K. Dey† Jiayuan Wang‡ Yusu Wang§

November 18, 2015

**Abstract**

In many data analysis applications the following scenario is commonplace: we are given a point set that is supposed to sample a hidden ground truth $K$ in a metric space, but it got corrupted with noise so that some of the data points lie far away from $K$ creating outliers also termed as *ambient noise*. One of the main goals of denoising algorithms is to eliminate such noise so that the curated data lie within a bounded Hausdorff distance of $K$. Deconvolution and thresholding, the two prevailing techniques for this problem suffer from the difficulty that they burden the user with setting several parameters and/or choosing an appropriate noise model while guaranteeing only asymptotic convergence. Our goal is to lighten this burden as much as possible while ensuring the theoretical guarantees in all cases. First, we show that there exists an algorithm requiring only a single parameter under a sampling condition that is not any more restrictive than the known prevailing models. Under such sampling conditions, this parameter cannot be avoided. We present a simple algorithm that avoids even this parameter by paying for it with a slight strengthening of the sampling condition which is not unrealistic. We provide some empirical evidence that our algorithms are effective in practice.

*Department of Computer Science and Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210, USA. mickael.buchet@m4x.org

†Department of Computer Science and Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210, USA. tamaldey@cse.ohio-state.edu

‡Department of Computer Science and Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210, USA. wang.6195@buckeyemail.osu.edu

§Department of Computer Science and Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210, USA. yusu@cse.ohio-state.edu

# 1 Introduction

Real life data is almost always corrupted by noise. Of course, when we talk about noise, there is an implicit assumption that the data is supposed to sample a hidden space called the *ground truth* with respect to which we measure the extent and type of noise. Some data can lie far away from the ground truth, leading to ambient noise, but the data density needs to be higher near the ground truth if signal has to prevail over noise. Therefore, a worthwhile goal of a denoising algorithm is to curate the data, eliminating the ambient noise while retaining most of the subset that lies within a bounded distance from the ground truth.

Classical algorithms known for denoising are based on mainly two types of techniques: Deconvolution and Thresholding. The deconvolution methods rely on a noise model. They require a generative noise model for the data. For example, the algorithm may assume that the input data has been sampled according to a probability measure obtained by convolving a distribution such as Gaussian [19] with a measure whose support is the ground truth. Alternatively, it may assume that the data is generated according to a probability measure with a small Wasserstein distance to a measure supporting the ground truth [6]. The denoising algorithm attempts to cancel the noise by deconvolving the data with the assumed model.

In more specific setting, specialized deconvolution algorithms exist. For example, in the case of blind image deconvolution, the noise is assumed to be consistent on several different images to allow for deconvolution [7]. While being a reasonable assumption in some practical cases such as optical defaults in cameras, it does not extend easily to a more general setting such as ours where the noise can be arbitrary between two measurements.

A deconvolution algorithm requires the knowledge of the generative model and at least a bound on the value of the standard deviation of the Gaussian convolution or the Wasserstein distance. Therefore, it requires at least one parameter as well as the knowledge of the noise type. The results obtained in this setting are often asymptotic, that is, theoretical guarantees hold in the limit when the number of points reaches infinity. These difficulties make it hard to obtain theoretical denoising guarantees on practical data.

The method of thresholding relies on a density estimation procedure [22] by which it estimates the density of the data locally. The data is cleaned, either by removing points around which density is lower than a threshold [14], or moving the data from such areas toward higher densities using gradient-like methods such as mean-shift [12, 21]. It has been recently used for uncovering geometric information such as one dimensional features [16]. In our work, we rely on a function called the *distance to a measure* [9] that can also be seen as a density estimator [2] which has been exploited for thresholding [4]. Other than selecting a threshold, these methods require the choice of a density estimator. This estimation requires at least one additional parameter in order to define a kernel or a mass for defining the distance to a measure. In the case of a gradient based movement of the points, the nature of the movement has to be defined to fix the length of a step and to determine the terminating condition of the algorithm.

**New work.** In these classical methods, the user is burdened with making several choices such as fixing an appropriate noise model, selecting a threshold and/or other parameters. Our main goal is to lighten this burden as much as possible. First, we show that a denoising algorithm with a single parameter exists and this parameter is in some sense unavoidable unless a stronger sampling condition is assumed. Next, we present an algorithm that is completely free of any parameter when the input satisfies a stronger sampling condition which is is not unrealistic.

Our first algorithm using a single parameter (presented in Section 3) operates on a very general sampling condition which is not stricter than those for the classical noise models mentioned previously because it holds with high probability for those models as well. Additionally, our sampling condition also allows ambient noise and locally adaptive samplings.

The single parameter required by our first algorithm is somewhat unavoidable under these conditions. This is illustrated by the example in Figure 1. Does the sample here represent a set of small circles or one big circle? The answer depends on the scale with which we examine the data. The choice of a parameter merely represents this choice of the scale. Trying to get rid of the parameter or the model is hopeless unless we assume some stronger hypothesis. This can be achieved, for example, assuming some kind of uniformity in the data. Aiming to keep the sampling restrictions as minimal as possible, we show that it is sufficient to assume the homogeneity in data *only on or close to* the ground truth for our second algorithm which requires no input parameter.



Figure 1: Ambiguity in scale

Specifically, the parameter-free algorithm presented in Section 4 relies on an iteration that intertwines our decluttering algorithm with a novel resampling procedure. Assuming that the sample is sufficiently dense and somewhat uniform near the ground truth at scales beyond a particular scale $s$, our algorithm selects a subset of the input point set that is close to the ground truth without requiring any input from the user. The output maintains the quality at scale $s$ even though the algorithm has no explicit knowledge of this parameter. See Figure 2 for an example.



Figure 2: From left to right: the ground truth, the noisy input samples (about 7000 total points, the ambient noise include 2000 points), two intermediate steps of our parameter-free denoising algorithm and the final output.

## 2 Preliminaries

We assume that the input is a set of points $P$ sampled around a hidden compact set $K$ (considered to be the ground truth) in a metric space $\mathbb{X}$. For simplicity, in what follows the reader can assume $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$ with $P, K \subset \mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$, and the metric $d_{\mathbb{X}}$ of $\mathbb{X}$ is simply the Euclidean distance. Our goal is to process $P$ into another point set $Q$ guaranteed to be Hausdorff close to $K$ and hence to be a better sample of the hidden space $K$ for further applications. By Hausdorff close, we mean that the (standard) *Hausdorff distance* $\delta_H(Q, K)$ between $Q$ and $K$, defined as the infimum of $\delta$ such that $\forall p \in Q, d_{\mathbb{X}}(p, K) \leq \delta$ and $\forall x \in K, d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, P) \leq \delta$, is bounded. Note that ambient noise/outliers

can incur very large Hausdorff distance.

The quality of the output point set $Q$ obviously depends on the "quality" of input points $P$, which we formalize via the language of *sampling conditions*. We wish to produce good quality output for inputs satisfying much weaker sampling conditions than a bounded Hausdorff distance. We use the sampling condition introduced and studied in [3, 4], which allows outliers and subsumes several common noise models such as Gaussian; see Chapter 6 of [3] for more discussion on this sampling condition. Below, we first introduce a basic sampling condition deduced from the one in [3, 4], and then introduce its extensions incorporating adaptivity and uniformity.

**Basic sampling condition.** Our sampling condition is built upon the concept of $k$-distance, which is a specific instance of a broader concept called "distance to a measure" introduced in [9]. It has properties similar to those of distance functions while being more robust to noise.

**Definition 2.1 ([9])** *Given a point $x \in \mathbb{X}$, let $p_i(x) \in P$ denote the $i$-th nearest neighbor of $x$ in $P$. The* $k$-distance *to a point set $P \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ is $d_{P,k}(x) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, p_i(x))^2}$.*

**Claim 2.2 ([9])** *$d_{P,k}(\cdot)$ is 1-Lipschitz, i.e. $|d_{P,k}(x) - d_{P,k}(y)| \leq d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)$ for $\forall (x, y) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}$.*

All our sampling conditions are dependent on the choice of $k$ in the $k$-distance, which we reflect by writing $\epsilon_k$ instead of $\epsilon$ in the sampling conditions.

**Definition 2.3 ([4])** *Given a compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ and a parameter $k$, a point set $P$ is an* $\epsilon_k$-noisy sample *of $K$ if*

1. $\forall x \in K,\ d_{P,k}(x) \leq \epsilon_k$
2. $\forall x \in \mathbb{X},\ d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, K) \leq d_{P,k}(x) + \epsilon_k$

The $k$-distance $d_{P,k}(x)$ is simply the average distance from $x$ to its $k$-nearest neighbors in $P$. The averaging makes it robust to outliers. One can view $d_{P,k}(x)$ as capturing the inverse of the density of points in $P$ around $x$ [2]. Condition 1 means that the density of $P$ on the compact set $K$ is bounded from below, that is, $K$ is well-sampled by $P$. Then, condition 2 implies that a point with low $k$-distance, i.e. lying in high density region, has to be close to $K$. In other words, $P$ can contain outliers which can form small clusters but their density can not be significant compared to the density of points near the compact set $K$. Notice that this is quite a reasonable requirement, as otherwise, without other prior knowledge, it becomes ambiguous whether a high density local cluster is a true signal or not.

These sampling conditions are very general. Specifically, they are satisfied when the data is generated with most of the common generative models, including convolution by a Gaussian and bounded Wasserstein distance. For details on this aspect, we refer the reader to Chapter 6 of [3].

In Section 4, we aim to develop a parameter-free denoising algorithm. As the example in Figure 1 illustrates, it is necessary to have a mechanism to remove potential ambiguity about the ground truth. We use a stronger sampling condition incorporating some degree of uniformity below:

**Definition 2.4** *Given a compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ and a parameter $k$, a point set $P$ is a uniform $(\epsilon_k, c)$-noisy sample of $K$ if $P$ is an $\epsilon_k$-noisy sample of $K$ (conditions 1 and 2 of Def. 2.3 hold) and*

3. $\forall p \in P,\ d_{P,k}(p) \geq \frac{\epsilon_k}{c}$.

This last condition restricts only to the input points. However, it implies the same relation for every point of the metric space $\mathbb{X}$ with $c$ being replaced by $\sqrt{2}c$ (see Lemma 4.1 of [5]).

It is important to note that the lower bound in Condition 3 enforces that sampling needs to be homogeneous (i.e, $d_{P,k}(x)$ is bounded both from above and from below by some constant factor of $\epsilon_k$) *only for points on and around* the ground truth $K$. This is because condition 1 in Def. 2.3 is only for points from $K$, and condition 1 together with the 1-Lipschitz property of $d_{P,k}$ (Claim 2.2) leads to an upper bound of $O(\epsilon_k)$ for $d_{P,k}(y)$ only for points $y$ within $O(\epsilon_k)$ distance to $K$. Notice that there is no such upper bound on $d_{P,k}$ for outliers and thus no homogeneity condition for them.

**Adaptive sampling conditions.** The sampling conditions given above are global meaning that they do not respect the "features" of the ground truth. To incorporate this possibility, we now introduce an adaptive version of the sampling condition with respect to a feature size function. Let $\bar{p}$ denote any one of the nearest points of $p$ in $K$. Observe that, in general, a point $p$ can have multiple such nearest points.

**Definition 2.5** *Given a compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{X}$, a feature size function $f : K \to \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ is a 1-Lipschitz non-negative real function on $K$.*

Several feature sizes exist in the literature of shape reconstruction and topology inference, including the *local feature size* [1], *local weak feature size*, *$\mu$-local weak feature size* [8] or *lean set feature size* [13]. All of these functions desscribe how complicated a compact set is locally, and therefore indicate how dense a sample should be locally so that information can be inferred faithfully. Any of these functions can be used as a feature size function to define the adaptive sampling below.

**Definition 2.6** *Given a compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{X}$, a feature size function $f$ of $K$, and a parameter $k$, a point set $P$ is an* uniform $(\epsilon_k, c)$-adaptive noisy sample *of $K$ if*

1. $\forall x \in K,\ d_{P,k}(x) \leq \epsilon_k f(x)$.
2. $\forall y \in \mathbb{X},\ d_K(y) \leq d_{P,k}(y) + \epsilon_k f(\bar{y})$.
3. $\forall p \in P,\ d_{P,k}(p) \geq \frac{\epsilon_k}{c} f(\bar{p})$.

*We say that $P$ is* an $\epsilon_k$-adaptive noisy sample *of $K$ if only conditions 1 and 2 above hold.*

Note that if the feature size function becomes zero somewhere, these conditions enforce a perfect sampling of that area. In such cases our theoretical results still hold, but since no realistic data can satisfy such a stringent condition, we assume that the feature size is *positive everywhere*.

# 3 Decluttering

In this section, we present a denoising algorithm which takes as input a set of points $P$ and a parameter $k$, and outputs a set of points $Q \subseteq P$ with the following guarantees: If $P$ is an $\epsilon_k$-noisy sample of a hidden compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{X}$, then the output $Q$ lies close to $K$ in the Hausdorff distance. This theoretical guarantee holds for both the non-adaptive and the adaptive cases, as stated in Theorems 3.3 and 3.7. For the adaptive case involving a feature size function $f$, the denoised point set $Q$ is also adaptive. We hence need an adaptive version of the Hausdorff distance denoted $\delta_H^f(Q, K)$ and defined as the infinum of $\delta$ such that (i) $\forall p \in Q$, $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p, K) \leq \delta f(\bar{p})$, and (ii)

$\forall x \in K, d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, Q) \leq \delta f(x)$, where $\bar{p}$ is a nearest point of $p$ in $K$. Also note that in the adaptive case, we do not know the feature size function $f$; the only parameter remains $k$.

**Algorithm 1:** Declutter($P$,$k$)

```
Data: Point set P, parameter k
Result: Denoised point set Q
begin
    sort P such that d_{P,k}(p_1) ≤ ··· ≤ d_{P,k}(p_{|P|}).
    Q_0 ⟵ ∅.
    for i ⟵ 1 to |P| do
        if Q_{i-1} ∩ B(p_i, 2d_{P,k}(p_i)) = ∅ then
            Q_i = Q_{i-1} ∪ {p_i}
        Q_i = Q_{i-1}.
    Q ⟵ Q_n
```

As the $k$-distance behaves like the inverse of density, points with a low $k$-distance are expected to lie close to the ground truth $K$. A probable approach could be to fix a threshold $\alpha$ and only keep the points with a $k$-distance less than $\alpha$. This simple-minded solution requires an additional parameter $\alpha$. Moreover, it does not work for adaptive samples, where the density in an area with large feature size can be lower than the density of noise close to an area with small feature size.

Our algorithm works around these problems by considering the points in order of increasing values of their $k$-distances and performing a novel pruning idea: Given a point $p_i$, if there exists a point $q$ deemed better in its vicinity, i.e. $q$ has smaller $k$-distance and has been previously selected ($q \in Q_{i-1}$), then $p_i$ is not necessary to describe the ground truth and we need not keep it. Conversely, if no point close to $p_i$ has already been selected, then $p_i$ is meaningful and we select it. The notion of "closeness" or "vicinity" is defined using the $k$-distance, requiring the number of parameters to be 1. In particular, the "vicinity" of a point $p_i$ is defined as the metric ball $B(p_i, 2d_{P,k}(p_i))$; observe that this radius is different for different points, and the radius of the ball is larger for outliers.

In what follows, we will make this intuition more concrete. We first consider the simpler non-adaptive case where $P$ is an $\epsilon_k$-noisy sample of $K$. We establish the Hausdorff closeness of $Q$ and the ground truth $K$ through the following two lemmas. The case of adaptive sampling is more involved and is dealt with afterward. First, the following lemma means that the ground truth $K$ is well-sampled (w.r.t. $\epsilon_k$) by the output $Q$ of our denoising algorithm.

**Lemma 3.1** *Let $Q \subseteq P$ be the output of* Declutter*$(P,k)$ where $P$ is an $\epsilon_k$-noisy sample of a compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{X}$. Then, for any $x \in K$, there exists $q \in Q$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, q) \leq 5\epsilon_k$.*

*Proof:* Let $x \in K$. By Condition 1 of Def. 2.3, we have $d_{P,k}(x) \leq \epsilon_k$. This means that the nearest neighbor $p_i$ of $x$ in $P$ satisfies that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, x) \leq d_{P,k}(x) \leq \epsilon_k$. If $p_i \in Q$, then the claim holds by setting $q = p_i$. If $p_i \notin Q$, there must exist $j < i$ with $p_j \in Q_{i-1}$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, p_j) \leq 2d_{P,k}(p_i)$. In other words, $p_i$ was removed by our algorithm because $p_j \in Q_{i-1} \cap B(p_i, 2d_{P,k}(p_i))$. Combining triangle inequality with the 1-Lipschitz property of $d_{P,k}$ (Claim 2.2), we then have that

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, p_j) \leq d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, p_i) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, p_j) \leq d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, p_i) + 2d_{P,k}(p_i) \leq 2d_{P,k}(x) + 3d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, x) \leq 5\epsilon_k,$$

which proves the claim. ∎

The next lemma implies that all outliers are removed by our denoising algorithm.

**Lemma 3.2** *Let $Q \subseteq P$ be the output of* Declutter*$(P,k)$ where $P$ is an $\epsilon_k$-noisy sample of a compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{X}$. Then, for any $q \in Q$, there exists $x \in K$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(q,x) \leq 7\epsilon_k$.*

*Proof:* Consider any $p_i \in P$ and let $\bar{p}_i$ be one of its nearest points in $K$. It is sufficient to show that if $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, \bar{p}_i) > 7\epsilon_k$, then $p_i \notin Q$ .

Indeed, by Condition 2 of Def. 2.3, $d_{P,k}(p_i) \geq d(p_i, \bar{p}_i) - \epsilon_k > 6\epsilon_k$. By Lemma 3.1, there exists $q \in Q$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(\bar{p}_i, q) \leq 5\epsilon_k$. Thus,

$$d_{P,k}(q) \leq d_{P,k}(\bar{p}_i) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(\bar{p}_i, q) \leq 6\epsilon_k.$$

Therefore, $d_{P,k}(p_i) > 6\epsilon_k \geq d_{P,k}(q)$ implying that $q \in Q_{i-1}$. Combining triangle inequality and Condition 2 of Def. 2.3, we have

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, q) \leq d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, \bar{p}_i) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(\bar{p}_i, q) \leq d_{P,k}(p_i) + \epsilon_k + 5\epsilon_k < 2d_{P,k}(p_i).$$

Therefore, $q \in Q_{i-1} \cap B(p_i, 2d_{P,k}(p_i))$, meaning that $p_i \notin Q$. ∎

**Theorem 3.3** *Given a point set $P$ which is an $\epsilon_k$-noisy sample of a compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{X}$, Algorithm* Declutter *returns a set $Q \subseteq P$ such that*

$$d_H(K, Q) \leq 7\epsilon_k.$$

Interestingly, if the input point set is uniform then the denoised set is also uniform, a fact that turns out to be useful for our parameter-free algorithm later.

**Proposition 3.4** *If $P$ is a uniform $(\epsilon_k, c)$-noisy sample of a compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{X}$, then the distance between any pair of points of $Q$ is at least $2\frac{\epsilon_k}{c}$.*

*Proof:* Let $p$ and $q$ be in $Q$ with $p \neq q$ and, assume without loss of generality that $d_{P,k}(p) \leq d_{P,k}(q)$. Then, $p \notin B(q, 2d_{P,k}(q))$ and $d_{P,k}(q) \geq \frac{\epsilon_k}{c}$. Therefore, $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p,q) \geq 2\frac{\epsilon_k}{c}$. ∎

**Adaptive case.** The case for adaptive samples is slightly more involved. Assume that Declutter has been called on an adaptive sample $P \subseteq \mathbb{X}$. Similar to the non-adaptive case, we establish the Hausdorff closeness of $P$ and output $Q$ via the following two lemmas. Their proofs can be found in Appendix A. Note that the algorithm does not need to know what the feature size function $f$ is.

**Lemma 3.5** *Let $Q \subseteq P$ be the output of* Declutter*$(P,k)$ where $P$ is an $\epsilon_k$-adaptive noisy sample of a compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{X}$. Then,*

$$\forall x \in K, \exists q \in Q,\ d_{\mathbb{X}}(x,q) \leq (5 + 4\epsilon_k)\epsilon_k f(x)$$

**Lemma 3.6** *Let $Q \subseteq P$ be the output of* Declutter*$(P,k)$ where $P$ is an $\epsilon_k$-adaptive noisy sample of a compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{X}$. Then,*

$$\forall q \in Q,\ d_{\mathbb{X}}(q, \bar{q}) \leq 7\epsilon_k f(\bar{q})$$

**Theorem 3.7** *Given an $\epsilon_k$-adaptive noisy sample $P$ of a compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ with $\epsilon_k \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and feature size $f$, Algorithm* Declutter *returns a sample $Q \subseteq P$ of $K$ where $\delta_H^f(Q,K) \leq 7\epsilon_k$.*

Again, we observe that, if the input set is uniform, the output remains uniform as stated below.

**Proposition 3.8** *Given an input point set $P$ which is an uniform $(\epsilon_k, c)$-adaptive noisy sample of a compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{X}$, the output $Q \subseteq P$ of* Declutter *satisfies*

$$\forall (q_i, q_j) \in Q,\ i \neq j \implies d_{\mathbb{X}}(q_i, q_j) \geq 2\frac{\epsilon_k}{c} f(\bar{q}_i)$$

*Proof:* Let $p_i$ and $q_i$ be two points of $Q$ with $i < j$. Then $p_i$ is not in the ball of center $p_j$ and radius $2d_{P,k}(p_j)$. Hence $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, p_j) \geq 2d_{P,k}(p_j) \geq 2\frac{\epsilon_k}{c} f(\bar{p}_j)$. Since $i < j$, it also follows that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, p_j) \geq 2d_{P,k}(p_j) \geq 2d_{P,k}(p_i) \geq 2\frac{\epsilon_k}{c} f(\bar{p}_i)$. ∎

The algorithm Declutter removes outliers from the input point set $P$. As a result, we obtain a point set which lies close to the ground truth with respect to the Hausdorff distance. Such point sets can be used for inference about the ground truth with further processing. For example, in topological data analysis, our result can be used to perform topology inference from noisy input points in the non-adaptive setting; see Appendix C for more details.

An example of the output of algorithm Declutter is given in Figure 3 (a) – (d). More examples (including for adaptive inputs) can be found in Appendix D.

# 4 Parameter-free decluttering

The algorithm Declutter is not entirely satisfactory. First, we need to fix the parameter $k$ a priori. Second, while providing a Hausdorff distance guarantee, this procedure also "sparsifies" input points. Specifically, the empty-ball test also enforces certain degree of sparsification, as for any point $q$ kept in $Q$, the ball $B(q, 2d_{P,k}(q))$ does not contain any other output points in $Q$. While this sparsification property is desirable for some applications, it removes too many points in some cases – See Figure 3 for an example, where the output density is dominated by $\epsilon_k$ and does not preserve the dense sampling provided by the input around the hidden compact set $K$.

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

Figure 3: (a) – (d) show results of the Algorithm Declutter. (a) the ground truth, (b) the noisy input with $\tilde{15}K$ points with 1000 ambient noisy points, (c) the output of Algorithm Declutter when $k = 9$, (d) the output of Algorithm Declutter when $k = 30$. In (e), we show the output of Algorithm ParfreeDeclutter. In fact, as shown in Appendix D, algorithm ParfreeDeclutter can remove ambient noise for much sparser input samples with more noisy points.

In this section, we address both of the above concerns by a novel iterative re-sampling procedure as described in Algorithm ParfreeDeclutter($P$). Roughly speaking, we start with $k = |P|$ and

**Algorithm 2:** ParfreeDeclutter($P$)

**Data**: Point set $P$
**Result**: Denoised point set $P_0$
**begin**
  Set $i_* = \lfloor \log_2(|P|) \rfloor$, and $P_{i_*} \longleftarrow P$
  **for** $i \longleftarrow i_*$ *to* 1 **do**
    $Q \longleftarrow$ Declutter($P_i$,$2^i$)
    $P_{i-1} \longleftarrow \cup_{q \in Q} B(q, (10 + 2\sqrt{2}) d_{P_i,k}(q)) \cap P_i$

gradually decrease it by halving each time. At iteration $i$, let $P_i$ denote the set of points so far kept by the algorithm; $i$ is initialized to be $\lfloor \log_2(|P|) \rfloor$ and is gradually decreased. We perform the denoising algorithm Declutter($P_i, k = 2^i$) given in the previous section, and obtain a denoised output set $Q$. This set can be too sparse. We enrich it by re-introducing some points from $P_i$, obtaining a denser sampling $P_{i-1} \subseteq P_i$ of the ground truth. This re-sampling process may bring some outliers back into the current set. However, it turns out that a repeated cycle of decluttering and resampling with decreasing values of $k$ removes these outliers progressively. See Figure 2 and also more examples in Appendix D. The entire process remains free of any user supplied parameter. In the end, we show that for an input that satisfies a uniform sampling condition, we can obtain an output set which is both dense and Hausdorff close to the hidden compact set, without the need for knowing the parameters of the input sampling conditions.

In order to formulate the exact statement of Theorem 4.1., we need to introduce a more relaxed sampling condition. We relax the notion of uniform $(\epsilon_k, c)$-noisy sample by removing condition 2. We call it a *weak uniform* $(\epsilon_k, c)$*-noisy sample*. Recall that condition 2 was the one forbidding the noise to be too dense. So essentially, a weak uniform $(\epsilon_k, c)$-noisy sample only concerns points on and around the ground truth, with no conditions on outliers.

**Theorem 4.1** *Given a point set $P$ and $i_0$ such that for all $i > i_0$, $P$ is a weak uniform $(\epsilon_{2^i}, 2)$-noisy sample of $K$ and is also an uniform $(\epsilon_{2^{i_0}}, 2)$-noisy sample of $K$, Algorithm* ParfreeDeclutter *returns a point set $P_0 \subseteq P$ such that $d_H(P_0, K) \leq (87 + 16\sqrt{2})\epsilon_{2^{i_0}}$.*

We elaborate a little on the sampling conditions. It would have been ideal if the theorem only required that $P$ is an uniform $(\epsilon_{2^{i_0}}, 2)$-noisy sample of $K$. However, to make sure that this uniformity is not destroyed during our iterative declutter-resample process before we reach $i = i_0$, we also need to assume that, *around the compact set*, the sampling is uniform for any $k = 2^i$ with $i > i_0$ (i.e, before we reach $i = i_0$). The specific statement for this guarantee is given in Lemma 4.3. However, while the uniformity for points *around the compact set* is required for any $i > i_0$, the condition that noisy points cannot be arbitrarily dense is *only* required for one parameter, $k = 2^{i_0}$. Recall also that the uniformity is necessary to obtain a parameter-free algorithm, as illustrated by Figure 1.

The constant for the ball radius in the resampling step is taken as $10 + 2\sqrt{2}$ which we call the resampling constant $C$. Our theoretical guarantees hold with this resampling constant though a value of 4 works well in practice. The algorithm reduces more noise with increasing $C$. On the flip side, the risk of removing points causing loss of true signal also increases with increasing $C$. Appendix D provides several results for Algorithm ParfreeDeclutter. While our theoretical guarantee is for non-adaptive case, in practice, the algorithm works well on adaptive sampling as well.

**Overview of proof for Theorem 4.1.** Aside from the technical Lemma 4.2 on the $k$-distance, the proof is divided into three steps. First, Lemma 4.3 shows that applying the loop of the algorithm once with parameter $2k$ does not alter the existing sampling conditions for $k' \leq k$. This implies that the $\epsilon_{2^{i_0}}$-noisy sample condition on $P$ will also hold for $P_{i_0}$. Then Lemma 4.4 guarantees that the step going from $P_{i_0}$ to $P_{i_0-1}$ will remove all outliers. Combined with Theorem 3.3, which guarantees that $P_{i_0-1}$ sample well $K$, it guarantees that the Hausdorff distance between $P_{i_0-1}$ and $K$ is bounded. Unfortunately, we do not know $i_0$ and we have no means for stopping the algorithm at this point. Hence, we need Lemma 4.5 to guarantee that the remaining iterations will not remove too many points and break the theoretical guarantees. The missing proofs are in Appendix B.

**Lemma 4.2** *Given a point set $Q$, $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $0 \leq i \leq k$, the distance to the $i$-th nearest neighbor of $x$ in $Q$ satisfies, $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, q_i) \leq \sqrt{\frac{k}{k-i+1}} d_{P,k}(x)$.*

**Lemma 4.3** *Let $P$ be a weak uniform $(\epsilon_{2k}, 2)$-noisy sample of $K$. For any $k' \leq k$ such that $P$ is a (weak) uniform $(\epsilon_{k'}, c)$-noisy sample of $K$ for some $c$, applying one step of the algorithm, with parameter $2k$ and resampling constant $C = 10 + 2\sqrt{2}$ gives a point set $P' \subseteq P$ which is a (weak) uniform $(\epsilon_{k'}, c)$-noisy sample of $K$.*

**Lemma 4.4** *Let $P$ be a uniform $(\epsilon_k, 2)$-noisy sample of $K$. One iteration of decluttering and resampling with parameter $k$ and resampling constant $C = 10 + 2\sqrt{2}$ provides a set $P' \subseteq P$ such that $d_H(P', K) \leq 8C\epsilon_k + 7\epsilon_k$.*

**Lemma 4.5** *Given a point $y \in P_i$, there exists $p \in P_0$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(y, p) \leq \kappa d_{P_i,2^i}(y)$, where $\kappa = \frac{18+17\sqrt{2}}{4}$.*

*Proof:* We show this lemma using an induction on $i$. First note that for $i = 0$ the result is trivial. Assuming that the results holds for all $j < i$ and taking $y \in P_i$, we distinguish three cases.

**Case 1:** $y \in P_{i-1}$ and $d_{P_{i-1},2^{i-1}}(y) \leq d_{P_i,2^i}(y)$.
Applying the recurrence hypothesis for $j = i - 1$ gives the result immediately.

**Case 2:** $y \notin P_{i-1}$. It means that $y$ has been removed by decluttering and not been put back by resampling. These together imply that there exists $q \in Q_i \subseteq P_{i-1}$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(y, q) \leq 2d_{P_i,2^i}(y)$ and $d_{\mathbb{X}}(y, q) > Cd_{P_i,2^i}(q)$ with $C = 10 + 2\sqrt{2}$. From the proof of Lemma 4.3, we know that the $2^{i-1}$ nearest neighbors of $q$ in $P_i$ are resampled and included in $P_{i-1}$. Therefore, $d_{P_{i-1},2^{i-1}}(q) = d_{P_i,2^{i-1}}(q) \leq d_{P_i,2^i}(q)$. Moreover, since $q \in P_{i-1}$, the inductive hypothesis implies that there exists $p \in P_0$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p, q) \leq \kappa d_{P_{i-1},2^{i-1}}(q) \leq \kappa d_{P_i,2^i}(q)$. Putting everything together, we get that there exists $p \in P_0$ such that

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(p, y) \leq d_{\mathbb{X}}(p, q) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(q, y) \leq \kappa d_{P_i,2^i}(q) + 2d_{P_i,2^i}(y) \leq \left(\frac{\kappa}{5+\sqrt{2}} + 2\right) d_{P_i,2^i}(y) \leq \kappa d_{P_i,2^i}(y).$$

The derivation above also uses the relation that $d_{P_i,2^i}(q) < \frac{1}{C} d_{\mathbb{X}}(y, q) \leq \frac{2}{C} d_{P_i,2^i}(y)$.

**Case 3:** $y \in P_{i-1}$ and $d_{P_{i-1},2^{i-1}}(y) > d_{P_i,2^i}(y)$.
The second part implies that at least one of the $2^{i-1}$ nearest neighbors of $y$ in $P_i$ does not belong to $P_{i-1}$. Let $z$ be such a point. Note that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(y, z) \leq \sqrt{2} d_{P_i,2^i}(y)$ by Lemma 4.2. For point $z$, we

can apply the second case and therefore, there exists $p \in P_0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{X}}(p,y) &\leq d_{\mathbb{X}}(p,z) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(z,y) \leq \left(\frac{\kappa}{5+\sqrt{2}} + 2\right) d_{P_i,2^i}(z) + \sqrt{2} d_{P_i,2^i}(y) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\kappa}{5+\sqrt{2}} + 2\right) \left(d_{P_i,2^i}(y) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(z,y)\right) + \sqrt{2} d_{P_i,2^i}(y) \\ &\leq \left(\left(\frac{\kappa}{5+\sqrt{2}} + 2\right)(1+\sqrt{2}) + \sqrt{2}\right) d_{P_i,2^i}(y) \leq \kappa d_{P_i,2^i}(y) \end{aligned}$$

■

**Proof of Theorem 4.1.** A repeated application of Lemma 4.3 (with weak uniformity) guarantees that $P_{i_0+1}$ is a weak uniform $(\epsilon_{2^{i_0+1}}, 2)$-noisy sample of $K$. One more application (with uniformity) provides that $P_{i_0}$ is uniform $(\epsilon_{2^{i_0}}, 2)$-noisy sample of $K$. Thus, Lemma 4.4 implies that $d_H(P_{i_0-1}, K) \leq (87 + 16\sqrt{2})\epsilon_{2^{i_0}}$. Notice that $P_0 \subset P_{i_0-1}$ and thus for any $p \in P_0$, $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p, K) \leq (87 + 16\sqrt{2})\epsilon_{2^{i_0}}$.

To show the other direction, consider any point $x \in K$. Since $P_{i_0}$ is a uniform $(\epsilon_{2^{i_0}}, 2)$-noisy sample of $K$, there exists $y \in P_{i_0}$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x,y) \leq \epsilon_{2^{i_0}}$ and $d_{P_{i_0},2^{i_0}}(y) \leq 2\epsilon_{2^{i_0}}$. Applying Lemma 4.5, there exists $p \in P_0$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(y,p) \leq \frac{18+17\sqrt{2}}{2}\epsilon_{2^{i_0}}$. Hence $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x,p) \leq \left(\frac{18+17\sqrt{2}}{2} + 1\right)\epsilon_{2^{i_0}} \leq (87 + 16\sqrt{2})\epsilon_{2^{i_0}}$. The theorem then follows. ■

# 5 Conclusions

We have presented a simple parameter-free algorithm for denoising under a reasonable sampling condition. This algorithm is easy to implement. The bulk of the computation time is spent on determining the $k$ nearest neighbor of points.

We do not provide guarantees for the parameter-free algorithm in an adaptive setting (although empirically the algorithm behaved well in experiments for adaptive case too). A partial result is presented in Appendix B, but the need for a small $\epsilon_k$ in the conditions defeat the attempts to obtain a complete result. It would be interesting to obtain the full guarantee for the adaptive setting. Similarly, in Appendix C, we show how to perform homology inference from noisy non-adaptive inputs. It would be interesting to extend such inference results to the adaptive setting, for which the approach taken in [13] can be helpful.

Parameter selection is a notorious problem for many algorithms in practice. Our aim is to study this aspect for the denoising problem–what types of parameters are truely necessary, and how can we minimize the use of parameters while ensuring theoretical guarantees. This quest leads to some interesting questions. For example, the output of ParfreeDeclutter is guaranteed to be close to the ground truth w.r.t. the Hausdorff distance. But this Hausdorff distance itself is not estimated. It appears that estimating this distance is difficult. We could estimate it if we knew the correct scale, i.e. $i_0$, to remove the ambiguity as exemplified in Figure 1. Interestingly, even with the uniformity condition, it is not clear how to estimate this distance in a parameter free manner.

Can we achieve parameter-free denoising under more general sampling conditions? It may be possible to obtain results by replacing uniformity with a different set of assumptions, for example topological assumptions: we could assume that the ground truth is a simply connected manifold without boundaries for example and use that fact to denoise and eventually reconstruct it.

## References


[1] Nina Amenta and Marshall Bern. Surface reconstruction by voronoi filtering. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 22:481–504, 1999.

[2] Gérard Biau, Frédéric Chazal, David Cohen-Steiner, Luc Devroye, Carlos Rodriguez, et al. A weighted k-nearest neighbor density estimate for geometric inference. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 5:204–237, 2011.

[3] Mickaël Buchet. *Topological inference from measures.* PhD thesis, Paris 11, 2014.

[4] Mickaël Buchet, Frédéric Chazal, Tamal K Dey, Fengtao Fan, Steve Y Oudot, and Yusu Wang. Topological analysis of scalar fields with outliers. In *31st Intl. Sympos. Comput. Geom. (SoCG)*, pages 827–841, 2015. The full version can be found at arXiv preprint *arXiv:1412.1680*.

[5] Mickaël Buchet, Frédéric Chazal, Steve Y Oudot, and Donald R Sheehy. Efficient and robust persistent homology for measures. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 168–180. SIAM, 2015.

[6] Claire Caillerie, Frédéric Chazal, Jérôme Dedecker, and Bertrand Michel. Deconvolution for the wasserstein metric and geometric inference. In *Geometric Science of Information*, pages 561–568. Springer, 2013.

[7] Patrizio Campisi and Karen Egiazarian. *Blind image deconvolution: theory and applications.* CRC press, 2007.

[8] Frédéric Chazal, David Cohen-Steiner, and André Lieutier. A sampling theory for compact sets in euclidean space. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 41(3):461–479, 2009.

[9] Frédéric Chazal, David Cohen-Steiner, and Quentin Mérigot. Geometric inference for probability measures. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 11(6):733–751, 2011.

[10] Frédéric Chazal and Steve Yann Oudot. Towards persistence-based reconstruction in euclidean spaces. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual symposium on Computational geometry*, pages 232–241. ACM, 2008.

[11] David Cohen-Steiner, Herbert Edelsbrunner, and John Harer. Stability of persistence diagrams. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 37(1):103–120, 2007.

[12] Dorin Comaniciu and Peter Meer. Mean shift: A robust approach toward feature space analysis. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on*, 24(5):603–619, 2002.

[13] Tamal K. Dey, Zhe Dong, and Yusu Wang. Sparsifying data for local uniformity and topology inference for manifolds. 2015.

[14] David L Donoho. De-noising by soft-thresholding. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 41(3):613–627, 1995.

[15] Herbert Edelsbrunner and John Harer. *Computational topology: an introduction.* American Mathematical Soc., 2010.

[16] Christopher R Genovese, Marco Perone-Pacifico, Isabella Verdinelli, Larry Wasserman, et al. On the path density of a gradient field. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(6A):3236–3271, 2009.

[17] Leonidas Guibas, Dmitriy Morozov, and Quentin Mérigot. Witnessed k-distance. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 49(1):22–45, 2013.

[18] Allen Hatcher. *Algebraic topology*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.

[19] Alexander Meister. *Deconvolutions problems in nonparametric statistics*. Lecture Notes in Statistics. Springer, 2009.

[20] James R Munkres. *Elements of algebraic topology*, volume 2. Addison-Wesley Reading, 1984.

[21] U. Ozertem and D. Erdogmus. Locally defined principal curves and surfaces. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:1249–1286, 2011.

[22] Bernard W Silverman. *Density estimation for statistics and data analysis*, volume 26. CRC press, 1986.

# A Missing Details from Section 3

**Proof of Lemma 3.5.** Let $x$ be a point of $K$. Then there exists $i$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, x) \leq d_{P,k}(x) \leq \epsilon_k f(x)$. If $p_i$ belongs to $Q$, then setting $q = p_i$ proves the lemma. Otherwise, because of the way that the algorithm eliminates points, there must exist $j < i$ such that $p_j \in Q_{i-1} \subseteq Q$ and

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, p_j) \leq 2d_{P,k}(p_i) \leq 2\left(d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, \bar{p}_i) + \epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i)\right),$$

the second inequality follows from the 1-Lipschitz property of $d_{P,k}$ function and the sampling Condition 1. It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, p_j) &\leq d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, p_i) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, p_j) \leq \epsilon_k f(x) + 2\left(d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, \bar{p}_i) + \epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i)\right) \\ &\leq \epsilon_k f(x) + 2d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, p_i) + 2\epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i) \leq 3\epsilon_k f(x) + 2\epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since the feature size function $f$ is 1-Lipschitz, observe that,

$$f(\bar{p}_i) \leq f(x) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, \bar{p}_i) \leq f(x) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, p_i) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, \bar{p}_i) \leq f(x) + 2d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, p_i) \leq (1 + 2\epsilon_k) f(x).$$

Thus,

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, p_j) \leq 3\epsilon_k f(x) + 2\epsilon_k(1 + 2\epsilon_k) f(x) = (5 + 4\epsilon_k)\epsilon_k f(x).$$

**Proof of Lemma 3.6.** Given that $Q \subset P$, we will show that for any $p_i \in P$ with $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, \bar{p}_i) \geq 7\epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i)$, the ball centered at $p_i$ with radius $2d_{P,k}(p_i)$ contains a point of $Q_{i-1}$. Therefore, $p_i$ is not selected by Declutter. Consequently, $p_i \notin Q$.

Consider a point $p_i \in P$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, \bar{p}_i) \geq 7\epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i)$. Due to the sampling conditions, $d_{P,k}(p_i) \geq d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, \bar{p}_i) - \epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i) \geq 6\epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i)$.

Moreover, $d_{P,k}(\bar{p}_i) \leq \epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i)$. Hence, there exists $p_j \in P$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(\bar{p}_i, p_j) \leq \epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i)$ and $d_{P,k}(p_j) \leq d_{\mathbb{X}}(\bar{p}_i, p_j) + d_{P,k}(\bar{p}_i) \leq 2\epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i) < d_{P,k}(p_i)$. Therefore, $j < i$. Algorithm Declutter ensures that, there exists $q \in Q_j$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_j, q) \leq 2d_{P,k}(p_j) \leq 4\epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i)$; note $q$ could be $p_j$ itself. Combining sampling conditions, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, q) &\leq d_{\mathbb{X}}(q, p_j) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_j, \bar{p}_i) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(p_i, \bar{p}_i) \leq 4\epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i) + \epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i) + d_{P,k}(p_i) + \epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i) \\ &\leq d_{P,k}(p_i) + 6\epsilon_k f(\bar{p}_i) \leq 2d_{P,k}(p_i). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have a point of $Q_{i-1}$ inside the ball of center $p_i$ and radius $2d_{P,k}(p_i)$, which guarantees that $p_i$ is not selected. The lemma then follows.

# B Missing Details from Section 4

**Proof of Lemma 4.2.** The claim is proved by the following derivation.

$$\frac{k-i+1}{k} d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, p_i)^2 \leq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=i}^{k} d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, p_j)^2 \leq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, p_j)^2 = d_{P,k}(x)^2.$$

**Proof of Lemma 4.3.** We show that if $P$ is a uniform $(\epsilon_{k'}, c)$-noisy sample of $K$, then $P'$ remains to be a uniform $(\epsilon_{k'}, c)$-noisy sample of $K$ as well. The similar version for weak uniformity follows from the same argument.

First, it is easy to see that as $P' \subset P$, the second and third sampling conditions of Def. 2.4 hold for $P'$ as well. What remains is to show Condition 1 also holds.

Take an arbitrary point $x \in K$. We know that $d_{P,2k}(x) \leq \epsilon_{2k}$ as $P$ is a weak uniform $(\epsilon_{2k}, 2)$-noisy sample of $K$. Hence there exists $p \in P$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p, x) \leq d_{P,2k}(x) \leq \epsilon_{2k}$ and $d_{P,2k}(p) \leq 2\epsilon_{2k}$. Writing $Q$ the result of the decluttering step, $\exists q \in Q$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p, q) \leq 2d_{P,2k}(p) \leq 4\epsilon_{2k}$. Moreover, $d_{P,2k}(q) \geq \frac{\epsilon_{2k}}{2}$ due to the uniformity condition for $P$.

Using Lemma 4.2, for $k' \leq k$, the $k'$ nearest neighbors of $x$, $NN_{k'}(x)$ satisfies:

$$NN_{k'}(x) \subset B(x, \sqrt{2}\epsilon_{2k}) \subset B(p, (1+\sqrt{2})\epsilon_{2k}) \subset B(q, (5+\sqrt{2})\epsilon_{2k}) \subset B(q, (10+2\sqrt{2}d_{P,2k}(q))$$

Hence $NN_{k'}(x) \subset P'$ and $d_{P',k'}(x) = d_{P,k'}(x) \leq \epsilon_k$. This proves the lemma.

**Proof of Lemma 4.4.** Let $Q$ denote the output after the decluttering step. Using Theorem 3.3 we know that $d_H(Q, K) \leq 7\epsilon_k$. Note that $Q \subset P'$. Thus, we only need to show that for any $p \in P'$, $d_{\mathbb{X}}(p, K) \leq 8C\epsilon_k + 7\epsilon_k$. Indeed, by the way the algorithm removes point, for any $p \in P'$, there exists $q \in Q$ such that $p \in B(q, Cd_{P,k}(q))$. It then follows that

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(p, K) \leq Cd_{P,k}(q) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(q, K) \leq C(\epsilon_k + d_{\mathbb{X}}(q, K)) + 7\epsilon_k \leq 8C\epsilon_k + 7\epsilon_k.$$

**The case of adaptive setting.** Unfortunately, our parameter-free denoising algorithm does not fully work in the adaptive setting. We can still prove that one iteration of the loop works. However, the value chosen for the resampling constant $C$ has to be sufficiently large with respect to the value of $\epsilon_k$. This condition is not verified when $k$ is large as $\epsilon_k$ will be very large.

**Theorem B.1** *Let $P$ be a point set that is both a uniform $(\epsilon_{2k}, 2)$-adaptive noisy sample and a uniform $(\epsilon_k, 2)$-adaptive noisy sample of $K$. Applying one step of the algorithm, with parameter $2k$ gives a point set $P'$ which is a uniform $(\epsilon_k, 2)$-adaptive noisy sample of $K$ when $\epsilon_{2k}$ is sufficiently small and the resampling constant $C$ is sufficiently large.*

*Proof:* As in the global conditions case, only the first condition has to be checked. Let $x \in K$ then there exists $q \in S$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, q) \leq 5\epsilon(2k)$ and $d_{P,2k}(q) \leq 2\epsilon(2k)$. The feature size $f$ is 1-Lipschitz and thus:

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &\leq f(\bar{q}) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(\bar{q}, x) \\ &\leq f(\bar{q}) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(q, \bar{q}) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(q, x) \\ &\leq f(\bar{q}) + d_{P,2k}(q_+\epsilon_{2k}f(\bar{q}) + 5\epsilon_{2k}f(x) \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$f(\bar{q}) \geq \frac{1 - 7\epsilon_{2k}}{1 + \epsilon_{2k}} f(x).$$

Therefore $d_{P,2k}(q) \geq \frac{1-7\epsilon_{2k}}{1+\epsilon_{2k}} \frac{\epsilon_{2k}}{2} f(x)$. The results is thus obtained if the constant $C$ verifies $C \geq \frac{2(5+\sqrt{2})(1+\epsilon_{2k})}{1-7\epsilon_{2k}}$ as $B(x, \sqrt{2}\epsilon_{2k}f(x)) \subset B(q, Cd_{P,2k}(q))$. ∎

## C Application to topological data analysis

In this section, we provide an example of using our decluttering algorithm for topology inference. We quickly introduce notations for some notions of algebraic topology and refer the reader to [15, 18, 20] for the definitions and basic properties. Our approaches mostly use standard arguments from the literature of topology inference; e.g, [10, 4].

Given a topological space $X$, we denote $H_i(X)$ its $i$-dimensional homology group with coefficients in a field. As all our results are independent of $i$, we will write $H_*(X)$. We consider the persistent homology of filtrations obtained as sub-level sets of distance functions. Given a compact set $K$, we denote the distance function to $K$ by $d_K$. We moreover assume that the ambient space is triangulable which ensures that these functions are tame and the persistence diagram $\mathrm{Dgm}(d_K^{-1})$ is well defined. We use $d_B$ for the bottleneck distance between two persistence diagrams. We recall the main theorem from [11] which implies:

**Proposition C.1** *Let $A$ and $B$ be two triangulable compact sets in a metric space. Then,*

$$d_B(\mathrm{Dgm}(d_A^{-1}), \mathrm{Dgm}(d_B^{-1})) \leq d_H(A, B).$$

This result trivially guarantees that the result of our decluttering algorithm allows us to approximate the persistence diagram of the ground truth.

**Corollary C.2** *Given a point set $P$ which is an $\epsilon_k$-noisy sample of a compact set $K$, our algorithm returns a set $Q$ such that*

$$d_B(\mathrm{Dgm}(d_K^{-1}), \mathrm{Dgm}(d_Q^{-1})) \leq 7\epsilon_k.$$

The algorithm reduces the size of the set needed to compute an approximation diagram. Previous approaches relying on the distance to a measure to handle noise ended up with a weighted set of size roughly $n^k$ or used multiplicative approximations which in turn implied a stability result at logarithmic scale for the Bottleneck distance [5, 17]. The present result uses an unweighted distance to compute the persistence diagram and provides guarantees without the logarithmic scale using fewer points than before.

If one is interested in inferring homology instead of computing a persistence diagram, the previous theorem guarantees that the Čech complex $C_\alpha(Q)$ or the Rips complex $R_\alpha(Q)$ can be used. Following [10], we use a nested pair of filtration to remove noise. Given $A \subset B$, we consider the map $\phi$ induced at the homology level by the inclusion $A \hookrightarrow B$. We denote $H_*(A \hookrightarrow B) = \mathrm{Im}(\phi)$. More precisely, denoting $K^\lambda = d_K^{-1}(\lambda)$,

**Proposition C.3** *Consider a point set $P$ which is an $\epsilon_k$-noisy sample of a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\epsilon_k < \frac{1}{28}\mathrm{wfs}(K)$. Then for all $\alpha$, $\alpha' \in [7\epsilon_k, \mathrm{wfs}(K) - 7\epsilon_k]$ such that $\alpha' - \alpha > 14\epsilon_k$ and for all $\lambda \in (0, \mathrm{wfs}(K))$, we have*

$$H_*(X^\lambda) \cong H_*(C_\alpha(Q) \hookrightarrow C_{\alpha'}(Q))$$

**Proposition C.4** *Consider a point set $P$ which is an $\epsilon_k$-noisy sample of a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\epsilon_k < \frac{1}{35}\mathrm{wfs}(K)$. Then for all $\alpha \in [7\epsilon_k, \frac{1}{4}(\mathrm{wfs}(K) - 7\epsilon_k)]$ and $\lambda \in (0, \mathrm{wfs}(K))$, we have*

$$H_*(X^\lambda) \cong H_*(R_\alpha(Q) \hookrightarrow R_{4\alpha}(Q))$$

These two proposition are direct consequences of [10, Theorems 3.5 & 3.6]. To be used, both these results need the input of one or more parameters, $\alpha$ and $\alpha'$, corresponding to a choice of scale. This cannot be avoided as it is equivalent to estimating the Hausdorff distance between a point set and an unknown compact set, problem discussed in the Introduction. However, by adding a uniformity hypothesis and knowing the uniformity constant $c$, the problem can be solved. We use the fact that the minimum $d_{P,k}$ over the point set $P$ is bounded from below. Let us write $\kappa = \min_{p \in P} d_{P,k}(p)$.

**Lemma C.5** *If $P$ is an $\epsilon_k$-noisy sample of $K$ then $\kappa \leq 2\epsilon_k$.*

*Proof:* Let $x \in K$, then there exists $p \in P$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x,p) \leq d_{P,k}(x) \leq \epsilon_k$. Therefore $\kappa \leq d_{P,k}(p) \leq d_{P,k}(x) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(x,p) \leq 2\epsilon_k$. ■

This trivial remark has the consequence that $c$ is greater than $\frac{1}{2}$ in any uniform $(\epsilon_k, c)$-noisy sample. We can compute $c\kappa$ and use it to define an $\alpha$ for using the previous propositions. We formulate the conditions precisely in the following propositions. Note that the upper bound for $\alpha$ is not necessarily known. However, the conditions imply that the interval of correct values for $\alpha$ is non-empty.

**Proposition C.6** *Consider a point set $P$ which is an uniform $(\epsilon_k, c)$-noisy sample of a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $c\epsilon_k < \frac{1}{56}\mathrm{wfs}(K)$. Then for all $\alpha$, $\alpha' \in [7c\kappa, \mathrm{wfs}(K) - 7c\epsilon_k]$ such that $\alpha' - \alpha > 14c\kappa$ and for all $\lambda \in (0, \mathrm{wfs}(K))$, we have*

$$H_*(X^\lambda) \cong H_*(C_\alpha(Q) \hookrightarrow C_{\alpha'}(Q))$$

*Proof:* Following Proposition C.3, we need to choose $\alpha$ and $\alpha'$ inside the interval $[7\epsilon_k, \mathrm{wfs}(K) - 7\epsilon_k]$. Using the third hypothesis, we know that $7c\kappa \geq 7c\epsilon_k$. We need to show that $\alpha$ and $\alpha'$ exist, i.e. $21c\kappa < \mathrm{wfs}(K) - 7\epsilon_k$. Recall that $c \geq 2$ , $\kappa \leq 2\epsilon_k$. Therefore, $21c\kappa + 7\epsilon_k \leq 56c\epsilon_k < \mathrm{wfs}(K)$. ■

**Proposition C.7** *Consider a point set $P$ which is a uniform $(\epsilon_k, c)$-noisy sample of a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $c\epsilon_k < \frac{1}{70}\mathrm{wfs}(K)$. Then for all $\alpha \in [7c\kappa, \frac{1}{4}(\mathrm{wfs}(K) - 7\epsilon_k)]$ and $\lambda \in (0, \mathrm{wfs}(K))$, we have*

$$H_*(X^\lambda) \cong H_*(R_\alpha(Q_n) \hookrightarrow R_{4\alpha}(Q_n))$$

The proof is similar to the one for the previous Proposition. Note that even if the theoretical bound can be larger, we can always pick $\alpha = 7c\kappa$ in the second case and the proof works. The sampling conditions on these results can be weakened by using the more general notion of $(\epsilon_k, r, c)$-sample of [3], assuming that $r$ is sufficiently large with respect to $\epsilon_k$.

# D Experimental results

In this section, we provide some empirical results for both of our algorithms. We start with the decluterring algorithm. This algorithm needs the input of a parameter $k$. This parameter has a direct influence on the result. On one hand, if $k$ is too small, not all noisy points are removed from the sample. On the other hand, if $k$ is too large, we remove too many points and end up with a very sparse sample that is unable to describe the underlying object precisely.



Figure 4: From left to right, the ground truth, the noisy input and the output of the decluttering algorihtm for $k = 81$ and $k = 148$

Figure 4 presents results of decluttering for the so-called Botijo example. In this case, no satisfying $k$ can be found. A $k$ sufficiently large to remove the noise creates an output set that is too sparse to describe the ground truth well.

We further illustrate the behavior of our algorithm by looking at the Hausdorff distance between the output and the ground truth, and at the cardinality of the output, in function of $k$ (Figure 5). Note that the Hausdorff distance drops suddenly when we remove the last of the outliers. However, it is already too late to represent the ground truth well as only a handful of points are kept at this stage. While sparsity is often a desired property, here it becomes a hindrance as we are no longer able to describe the underlying set.




Figure 5: Hausdorff distance between the ground truth and the output of the declutter algorithm and cardinality of this output in function of $k$.

The introduction of the resample step allows us to solve this sparsity problem. If we were able to choose the right parameter $k$, we could simply sparsify and then resample to get a good output. One can hope that the huge drop in the left graph could be used to choose the parameter. However, the knowledge of the ground truth is needed to compute it, and estimating the Hausdorff distance between a set and the ground truth is impossible without some additional assumptions like the

uniformity we use.

We will now illustrate our parameter-free denoising algorithm on examples in various dimensions. Recall that the parameter-free algorithm relies on the uniformity of the sample around the ground truth to have theoretical guarantees.

We start with some curves in the plane. Figure 6 shows the results on two different inputs. In both cases, the curves have self-intersections. The noisy input are again obtained by moving every input point according to a Gaussian distribution and adding some white background noise. The details of the noise models can be found in Table 1 and the details on the size of the various point sets are given in Table 2.

The first steps of the algorithm remove the outliers lying further away from the ground truth. As the value of the parameter $k$ decreases, we remove nearby outliers. The result is a set of points located around the curves, in a tubular neighborhood of width that depends on the standard deviation of the Gaussian noise. Small sharp features are lost due to the blurring created by the Gaussian noise but the Hausdorff distance between the final output and the ground truth is as good as one can hope for when using a method oblivious of the ground truth.



Figure 6: Results of our parameter-free denoising algorithm on two samples of one dimensional compact sets. From left to right, the ground truth, the noisy input, two intermediate steps of the algorithm, and the final result.

Figure 7 presents results obtained on an adaptive sample of a three dimensional manifold. We consider again the so-called botijo example with an adaptive sampling. Contrary to the previous curves that were sampled uniformly, the density of this point set depends on the local feature size. We also generate the noisy input the same way, using a Gaussian noise at each point that has a standard deviation proportional to the local feature size.

Despite the absence of theoretical guarantees for the adaptive setting, our parameter-free denoising algorithm removes the outliers while maintaining the points close to the ground truth.

Finally, our last example is on a high dimensional data set. We use subsets of the MINIST



Figure 7: Experiment on a three dimensional manifold. From left to right, the ground truth, the noisy input, two intermediate steps of the algorithm and the final result.

| Figure | Standard deviation of Gaussian | Size of ambient noise (percentage) |
|---|---|---|
| Figure 6 first row | 0.05 | 2000 (37.99%) |
| Figure 6 second row | 0.05 | 2000 (45.43%) |
| Figure 7 | 0.1 | 2000 (28.90%) |

Table 1: Parameter of the noise model for Figure 6 and Figure 7

| Figure | Sample | Ground truth | Noise input | Intermediate steps | | Final result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Figure 6 first row | uniform | 5264 | 7264 | 6026 | 5875 | 5480 |
| Figure 6 second row | uniform | 4402 | 6402 | 5197 | 4992 | 4475 |
| Figure 7 | adaptive | 6921 | 8921 | 7815 | 7337 | 6983 |

Table 2: Cardinality of each dataset in Figure 6 and Figure 7

database. This database contains handwritten digits. We take all "1" digits (1000 occurrences) and add some other digits to constitute the noise. Every image is a $28 \times 28$ matrix and is considered as a point in dimension 784. We then use the $L_2$ metric between the images. Table 3 contains our experiment result.

| Ground truth | Noise | Images removed after sampling | Digit 1 removed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1000 digit 1 | 200 digit 7 | 85 | 5 |
| 1000 digit 1 | 200 digit 8 | 94 | 5 |
| 1000 digit 1 | 200 digit 0-9 except 1 | 126 | 9 |

Table 3: Experiment on high-dimension datasets. The third and forth columns show number of corresponding images.

Our algorithm only partially removes the noisy points but also removes some of the good points.

If we add some random points in our space, we no longer encounter this problem. The results are less accurate than in the case of a geometric sampling. This can be partially attributed to the choice of the metric, which is not the most pertinent one when considering images as it is sensitive to small translations or rotations of the digit.